

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

10/564308

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PHUS030232WO	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/IB2004/051157	International filing date (day/month/year) 07 July 2004 (07.07.2004)	Priority date (day/month/year) 11 July 2003 (11.07.2003)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.			

1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.

In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).

Date of issuance of this report 16 January 2006 (16.01.2006)	
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Idhir Britel
Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 60

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 20 DEC 2004

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WIPO PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

20/1

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051157

International filing date (day/month/year)
07.07.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
11.07.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
G09G3/34

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS, N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Harke, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7032



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051157

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/051157

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).
☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3,8
	No: Claims	1,2,4-7,9-20
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	3,8
	No: Claims	1,2,4-7,9-20
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-20
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Re Item V.

- 1 The following document is referred to in this communication:
D1 : WO 03/044765 A (E INK CORP) 30 May 2003 (2003-05-30)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses in the passages from page 1, line 1 to line 12, and from page 45, line 3 to page 47, line 20) a method for updating an image on a bi-stable display by driving at least a portion of the display from a current optical state to a final optical state (method of driving bistable electro-optic displays, D1: page 1, line 1 to line 12), the method comprising:

driving the at least a portion of the display from the current optical state to a reference optical state; wherein the reference optical state is selected based on the current optical state (erasing pulse to erase the display from the previous state to one extreme optical state, wherein for the even-prepare case the sum of the impulses of the previous writing pulse and the erasing pulse should be equal to the impulse necessary to fully transition to the extreme optical state, D1: page 45, line 3 to line 23); and

driving the at least a portion of the display from the reference optical state to the final optical state (application of the blanking pulses and the writing pulse, which is chosen based only on the desired optical state to be achieved, D1: page 45, line 3 to page 46, line 7).

3 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 16

- 3.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 16 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses, as shown in section 2.1. above, all the technical features

of the claim 16.

4 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 17

- 4.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 17 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses, as shown in section 2.1. above, all the technical features of the claim 17.

5 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 18

- 5.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 18 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1 discloses, as shown in section 2.1. above, all the technical features of the claim 18.

6 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 19, 20

Dependent claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 9-15, 19, 20 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).

7 DEPENDENT CLAIMS 3, 5, 8

The combination of the features of dependent claims 3, 5, 8 are neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art. The reasons are as follows:

Document D1 does not disclose the technical features claimed in any of claims 3, 5, 8.

- 8** As can be seen from document D1, all the claims 1 to 20 are industrially

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/051157

applicable (Art. 33 (4) PCT).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY